

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite a fluoropolymer solid matter content of “40 to 80% by mass” relative to the fluoropolymer aqueous dispersion. Support is found, for example, at page 22, lines 15-19 of the specification as filed. No new matter is presented. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested as placing the case in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Doughty, Jr., et al in view of Hirono et al as evidenced by Hoshikawa et al.

Claims 9-10 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Without conceding the merits of the rejection, claim 1 is amended herein to recite that the fluoropolymer aqueous dispersion has a fluoropolymer solid matter content of 40 to 80%. Thus, the present invention is directed to a fluoropolymer aqueous dispersion having a fluoropolymer solid matter content of 40 to 80%, wherein the supernatant for assaying has a fluorine-containing anionic surfactant content of not higher than 100 ppm and a ratio (A1/A0) of not lower than 0.4.

Contrarily, Doughty Jr., et al discloses an aqueous dispersion having a fluoropolymer solid matter content of 28% and 36% (see Examples 1 and 3 of Doughty, Jr. et al). Thus the dispersion of Doughty, Jr. et al is not within the presently claimed range.

Similarly, Hirono et al does not disclose a fluoropolymer aqueous dispersion having a fluoropolymer solid matter content of 40 to 80%.

Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest the presently claimed invention, whether taken alone or in combination. Therefore, the fluoropolymer aqueous dispersion of amended claim 1 is unobvious over the cited references.

Claims 2-7, 9-10 and 12-15 depend directly, or indirectly from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and objection to the claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Jennifer M. Hayes
Registration No. 40,641

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 14, 2009